

Impact of Sport Tourism on the Host Community: A Case Study of Nigerian University Games

Yusuf T.G.

Hospitality and Tourism Management Unit

Department of Family, Nutrition and Consumer Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture

Obafemi Awolowo Awolowo University, Ile – Ife, Osun State, Nigeria

Abstract

The study investigated the tourism impact of NUGA (Nigerian University Games Association) on the host community of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile – Ife, Osun State, Nigeria which hosted the 24th edition of the games between 11th February and 22nd February, 2014. Research methods involved in gathering data were participant observation, interview and questionnaires. The questionnaires were used to elicit information from one hundred and ninety – four respondents who were selected by simple random technique. The event featured fifteen games and more than 7,000 athletes and officials from over 60 universities participated in the biennial games. The study specifically identified the benefits of hosting NUGA games by the University, determined the negative effects of the event and established the residents' perception of sport tourism. The study also identified the motivating factors for hosting sport tourism event and this include: conducive weather condition, support from government and sponsors, economic gains, community prestige, hospitality of residents, security and availability of sporting facilities, fund, accommodation and social infrastructures. Four hypotheses were tested, conclusions were drawn and necessary recommendations towards attaining and sustaining the goals and objectives of NUGA were offered.

Keywords: Sport Tourism, Impact, NUGA, Host Community

Introduction

The first connections between sport and tourism emerged in the early mid – nineteenth century A.D. with English competitive sports as a central pillar of modern western sports (alongside German exercises and Swedish gymnastics). Standeven (1994) dated the first connections between sport and tourism to the year 1827. It is debatable, however, whether this connection can really be attached to a particular year. Pigeassou *et al.* (1998) located the connection between tourism and sport in the emergence of alpine winter – sports in the nineteenth century, but assumes the autonomy of the sport tourism domain to be only since the 1950s. Standeven and De Knop (1999) also provided that forms of sport tourism may be dated back to the times of the ancient Greeks. Weed and Bull (2009) defined sport tourism as a social, economic and cultural phenomenon developed from the unique interaction of people, place and activity. Sport tourism is one of the largest and fastest – growing segments of the travel and tourism industry and one that is receiving increased attention for its social, environmental, and economic development and opportunities (Standeven and De Knop 1999). It is widely understood that major sporting events contribute significantly to the economic development and tourist traffic in a city or region where the sporting takes place (Higham, 1999, Turco *et al.*, 2003). Sport tourism is a vital component of the marketing mix for tourist destinations (Getz, 1997, Gibson, 1998). Gibson (1998) described sport tourism as leisure-based travel which takes person(s) outside their usual environment for the purpose of watching, participating (in physical activities) or adoring attractions associated with physical activities.

History of Nigerian University Games Association (NUGA): The association was founded in 1965 and the first game was held in the following year (1966) at the University of Ibadan (the premier university in Nigeria). The game association was formed by Nigerian first generation universities which are five in number, these are; University of Lagos, Akoka, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, University of Ibadan, and University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University). NUGA has fifteen (15) approved sporting activities. These are; track and field, badminton, basketball, hockey, chess, cricket, judo, soccer, squash, table tennis, tae Kwando, lawn tennis, volley ball, swimming, and hand ball. NUGA has gone beyond borders. In 1970, NUGA became a member of World Federation of Universities Games Association and has continuously taken part in the World University Games and other activities of the Federation since then. When all African Universities' Games' Association was founded in 1974, NUGA was a founding member. The major objectives of NUGA include; promotion of friendship through participation in sporting activities among University students in Nigeria, development of sports facilities in Nigerian Universities, and enhancing the development of sports in Nigeria through contribution of elite athletes from University sports competitions to the national teams. The main purpose of setting up NUGA was to create an atmosphere of friendly interaction among universities in Nigeria. This highly welcome goal is expected to unite all Nigerian universities for peaceful co – existence. Ojeme (2010) enumerated purpose of sports development in Nigeria as physical fitness for all, self-actualization, improvement of international relations, promotion of friendship, provision of employment, youth mobilization,

promotion of recreation and competitive sports, promotion of women sports etc.

Statement of the Problem: Various studies have been carried out by different researchers in the area of impact of sport tourism event on the host community. These studies have identified and classified economic impact of sport tourism to include: provision of temporary and permanent jobs, increasing cash flow in the community within and sometimes beyond the period of the event, improving standard of living, attracting new investments to host community and encouraging local entrepreneurship. Social benefits of sport tourism event documented in the literatures includes: sense of pride, entertainment, family and community cohesion, self – actualization and provision/improvement in infrastructural facilities. Environmental benefits pointed out in earlier studies include: the provision of incentives for the conservation of natural resources and provision/maintenance of infrastructures such as recreational parks, sporting facilities, car parks, road etc. However, all these benefits have not come without their costs. From previous studies, negative effects such as forceful relocation of residents to accommodate tourists, crowding, hooliganism, crime, consumption of hard drugs, disruptions of the normal life of the local people, increased rents and tax rate were all identified as negative effects of sport tourism on host communities. A good example is Sydney 2000 Olympics where the cost of living soared immediately it was announced to host the 2000 Olympics. Also, the impact of sport tourism on the environment can be negative as a result of clearing of trees, building ski huts thereby increasing waste and carbon emission, traffic congestion, built-up construction areas, noise pollution, light pollution and overcrowding. However, these previous studies have used mega sport tourism events such as FIFA World Cup and Olympics to examine the impact of sport tourism event on the host community, hence the essence of this study, to ascertain the degree of conformity or otherwise of these previous research findings to what obtains when an event involving a segment of a population of a nation is involved such as the Nigeria University Games (NUGA). It is also significant to study the peculiarities of sport tourism event of this magnitude.

Objectives of the Study: Haven hosted the 24th edition of NUGA games between 11th and 22nd of February in 2014; the main objective of this study was to examine the tourism impact of Nigerian University Games on Obafemi Awolowo University. The specific objectives were to:

- i. identify the benefits of hosting sport tourism event by Obafemi Awolowo University,
- ii. identify the negative effects of sport tourism on the host community,
- iii. investigate the residents' perception of sport tourism, and
- iv. identify the motivating factors for hosting sport tourism event.

Research Questions: The research questions formulated to guide this study include the following:

- i. What are the benefits of hosting sport tourism event by O.A.U.?
- ii. What are the negative effects of hosting sport tourism event by the university during 2012/2013 academic session?
- iii. How do residents perceive sport tourism?, and
- iv. What are the motivating factors for hosting sport tourism event?

Methodology: The research design that was adopted for this study was a descriptive survey which falls within the empirical research methodology and which aims at fact-findings. This approach is appropriate in collecting the necessary information required for this study, which is an in-depth inquiry into the evaluation of the impact of sport tourism on the host community.

Data Collection, Population and Sampling Techniques: The target population for the study consists of residents of Obafemi Awolowo University. Among the residents are people of various socio – economic class. These include: lecturers, administrators, technologists, clerical staff, technicians, students, traders, artisans etc. whose offices, residence or businesses are located within the University. A simple random sampling technique was used to select the respondents that were involved in the study. A total number of two hundred questionnaires were administered but one hundred and ninety – four were recovered for analysis. Key informant interview and observation method of data gathering were also employed during the course of this study.

Results and Discussion

- i. On the arrival of the tourists, there was a chaos due to the refusal of the students of Obafemi Awolowo University to willingly surrender their accommodation for the use of the tourists, and if not for the fact that the students' union was under proscription and that the students were just resuming after a long break due to ASUU (Academic Staff Union of Universities) strike, this problem might be difficult to resolve. This finding is in support of the submissions of Andriotis (2005) who asserted that the hospitality of the local community is vital to the tourism industry and that of Murphy (1985) who stated that 'if the host community is antagonistic to visitors, no amount of attractions will compensate for the rudeness or hostility'.
- ii. *Sport tourism embraces some elements of cultural tourism.* On the day of the opening ceremony, all the contingents (the participating Universities) march past the high table where dignitaries were seated and around the sporting arena to register their presence. Majority of the participating Universities were in

traditional attires of their geographical locations and some delegates displayed the dancing steps of their localities. This observation is in consonance with that of Ifeanyichukwu (2013) who stated that “at the opening and closing ceremony of the 17th National Sports Festival held in Rivers State, Nigeria between 3rd and 10th July 2011, athletes from different states showcased their popular pattern of dressing.

- iii. There was a period of time when the officials stopped the games and went on strike. Investigation revealed that they were protesting non – payment of their entitlements. This did not go down well with many tourists who had come to relax and enjoy the games.
- iv. Local Organizing Committee allotted spaces to the interested members of the host community at the rate of twenty thousand naira (#20,000) per space in the proposed market for the event. The problems that ensued from this were that; the spaces were small, the market was sighted about 500 metres to 1 kilometers away from the sporting arena and ultimately, the hawkers were getting the market while the accredited sellers witnessed low/no patronage. At the end of it all, the market was relocated close to the sporting arena. Therefore, people who have the experience of organizing event of this nature should make up a larger percentage of the organizing committee.



Plate 1: Cultural Performance during the event

- v. **Key Informant Interview** with Agboola (2014), who is a resident of the host community revealed that the legacy of the 2014 NUGA games hosted by Obafemi Awolowo University is not satisfactory when compared with the legacy of the previous editions hosted by the same University. He stated that the legacies of the recent edition include an Olympic size swimming pool and a tartan tract for athletics which are beneficial only to sport loving members of the host community rather than the previous edition that lead to the building of two hostels; Angola Hall and Mozambique Hall that have served and still serving all students. This interviewee’s opinion corroborates that of the Andriotis (2005) who stated that destination should be developed according to host community needs. In this case, according to the interviewee, hostel is a more pressing need for the University (above 60% of the students reside outside the school) rather than the capital intensive sporting facilities.
- vi. **Interview** with the foreigner tourists sighted during the event (plate 2 below) revealed that if well planned and organized, NUGA has the potential of attracting international tourists.



Plate 2: foreigner tourists sighted during the games. Photograph by the researcher: T.G. Yusuf (2014)

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Socio – Economic Characteristics

n = 194

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Sex		
Male	118	60.8
Female	76	39.2
Age (Years)		
19 – 40	149	76.8
41 and above	45	23.2
Religion		
Islam	90	46.4
Christianity	103	53.1
Others	1	0.52
Tribe		
Yoruba	159	82
Hausa	8	4.1
Igbo	24	12.4
Non – Nigerian	3	1.5
Marital Status		
Single	142	73.2
Married	47	24.2
Others	5	2.6
Number of Children		
None	144	74.2
1 – 4	41	21.1
5 and above	9	4.6
Level of Education		
None	4	2.1
Primary	9	4.6
Secondary	12	6.2
Tertiary	169	87.1
Type of Work		
Students	119	61.3
Civil Servants	57	29.4
Traders	14	7.2
Artisans	3	1.5
Farmers	1	0.5
Monthly Income		
Less than #20,000	108	55.7
#21,000 - #50,000	38	19.6
#51,000 and above	48	24.7
Social Organization		
Yes	105	54.1
No	85	43.8

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Data in table 1 showed the socio – economic status of the respondents. The table revealed that 60.8% of the respondents were males and 39.2 % were females, 76.8% aged between 19 – 40 years and 23.2 % aged between 41 years and above. Majority (82%) of the respondents were of Yoruba tribe, 12.4% were Igbo, 4.1% were Hausa while just three (1.5%) were Non – Nigerians, 46.4% were Muslims, 53.1% were Christians while one respondent did not belong to any of the two major religions in Nigeria. Also, 73.2% were single, 24.2% were married, 74.2% had no children, 21.1% had between I – 4 children and just 4.6% had 5 children and above. A survey of the educational background of the respondents revealed that 87.1% had tertiary education, 6.2% had secondary education, 4.6% had primary education and four (2.1%) of the respondents had no formal education. Majority (61.3%) of the respondents were students, 29.4% were civil servants, 7.2% were traders, 1.5% were artisans and just one respondent (0.5%) was a farmer. An inquiry into the monthly income of the interviewees showed that 55.7% earned #20,000 and below, 19.6% earned between #21,000 and #50,000 and 24.7% earned #51, 000 and above. Lastly, while 54.1% of the respondents belonged to social organizations, 43.8% did not belong to such organizations. These findings showed that the respondents randomly selected for this research were of diverse socio – economic status.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Perception of Sport Tourism

Statements on Perception	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq (%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq (%)	Mean
The cost involved in sport tourism does not worth it.	17 (8.8)	18 (9.3)	18 (9.3)	63 (32.5)	78 (40.2)	2.14
Sport tourism increases crime rate.	11 (5.7)	34 (17.5)	19 (9.8)	59 (30.4)	71 (36.6)	2.25
Sport tourism encourage social vices	18 (9.3)	41 (21.1)	26 (13.4)	68 (35.1)	41 (21.1)	2.50
It increases the cost of living.	17 (8.8)	58 (29.9)	40 (20.6)	47 (24.2)	32 (16.5)	2.50
It causes traffic congestion, noise and pollution.	33 (17.0)	72 (37.1)	31 (16.0)	33 (17.0)	25 (12.9)	3.29
It disrupts the normal activity of the host community.	30 (15.5)	65 (33.5)	31 (16.0)	36 (18.6)	32 (16.5)	3.13
Construction of sport tourism facilities destroys the natural environment.	25 (12.9)	40 (20.6)	23 (11.9)	55 (28.4)	51 (26.3)	2.50
Its benefits far outweigh its cost.	55 (28.4)	60 (30.9)	40 (20.6)	21 (10.8)	18 (9.3)	3.78
It improves resident's standard of living.	66 (34.0)	69 (35.6)	33 (17.0)	23 (11.9)	3 (1.5)	3.87
It provides seasonal employment opportunities.	97 (50)	67 (34.5)	19 (9.8)	8 (4.1)	3 (1.5)	4.27
It promotes local entrepreneurship.	92 (47.4)	77 (39.7)	15 (7.7)	7 (3.6)	3 (1.5)	4.44
It is a good opportunity to showcase the culture of the host community.	110(56.7)	62 (32.0)	14 (7.2)	7 (3.6)	1 (0.5)	4.41
It facilitates provision, maintenance and improvement of social infrastructures.	100(51.5)	66 (34.0)	20 (10.3)	4 (2.1)	4 (2.1)	4.31
It stimulates the provision and development of existing sporting facilities.	101(52.1)	63 (32.5)	13 (6.7)	7 (3.6)	10 (5.2)	4.23
Attending sport tourism event is a complete waste of time.	19 (9.8)	19 (9.8)	21 (10.8)	48 (24.7)	87 (44.8)	2.15
It disrupts academic calendar.	35 (18)	64 (33.0)	32 (16.5)	38 (19.6)	25 (12.9)	3.20

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Data in table 2 showed the distribution of respondents on how they perceive sport tourism. Findings showed that majority of the interviewees agreed that: sport tourism promotes local entrepreneurship (mean = 4.44), it is a good opportunity to showcase the culture of the host community (mean = 4.41), it facilitates the provision, maintenance and improvement of social infrastructures (mean = 4.31), it stimulates the provision and development of existing sporting facilities (mean = 4.23), it provides seasonal employment opportunities (mean = 4.27), it improves residents' standard of living (mean = 3.87), its benefits far outweighs its costs (mean = 3.78), it disrupts academic calendar (mean = 3.20), it causes traffic congestion, noise and pollution (mean = 3.29) and that it disrupts the normal activities of the host community (mean = 3.13). While majority of the respondents were neutral about sport tourism increasing the cost of living (mean = 2.50), encouraging social vices (mean = 2.50) and that construction of sport tourism facilities destroys the natural environment (mean = 2.50), majority also disagreed that it increases crime rate (mean = 2.25), attending sport tourism events is a complete waste of time (mean = 2.15) and that the cost involved in sport tourism does not worth it (mean = 2.14). Since the common opinion of the respondents involved in this study were neutral about sport tourism event leading to

general increase in prices of commodities and that it causes traffic congestion, noise and pollution. Hence, these results are in line with the findings of Nancy and Craig (2010) who also concluded that sport tourism event does not lead to these problems. However, this could be due to the fact the events involved in both studies were not mega in nature.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Impact of Sport Tourism

Impact of Sport Tourism	Strongly Agree Freq (%)	Agree Freq (%)	Undecided Freq (%)	Disagree Freq (%)	Strongly Disagree Freq (%)	Mean
It distorts the pristine culture of the host community.	27 (13.9)	19 (9.8)	31 (16.0)	75 (38.7)	42 (21.6)	2.50
It promotes host cultural activities.	79 (40.7)	79 (40.7)	21 (10.8)	8 (4.1)	7 (3.6)	4.16
It provides opportunity to attend interesting event.	101(52.1)	71 (36.6)	17 (8.8)	3 (1.5)	2 (1.0)	4.37
It is an opportunity to have fun with family and friends.	102(52.6)	71 (36.6)	14 (7.2)	5 (2.6)	2 (1.0)	4.37
It establishes the host cultural identity.	95 (49.0)	71 (36.6)	17 (8.8)	6 (3.1)	5 (2.6)	4.26
It increases entertainment opportunity for the residents.	106(54.6)	70 (36.1)	12 (6.2)	3 (1.5)	3 (1.5)	4.41
It provides opportunity to meet new people.	124(63.9)	52 (26.8)	13 (6.7)	3 (1.5)	2 (1.0)	4.51
It makes residents feel good about themselves and their community.	96 (49.5)	70 (36.1)	17 (8.8)	8 (4.1)	3 (1.5)	4.28
It showcases the host community in the positive light.	85 (43.8)	66 (34.0)	32 (16.5)	3 (1.5)	8 (4.1)	4.12
It promotes the development and maintainance of public facilities.	98 (50.5)	71 (36.6)	14 (7.2)	6 (3.1)	5 (2.6)	4.57
It creates temporary job opportunities.	104(53.6)	64 (33.0)	13 (6.7)	10 (5.2)	3 (1.5)	4.60
It increases turn over for businesses.	99 (51.0)	68 (35.1)	16 (8.2)	5 (2.6)	6 (3.1)	4.28
It improves the standard of living of residents who engaged in commodities' supply during the games.	86 (44.3)	74 (38.1)	19 (9.8)	9 (4.6)	6 (3.1)	4.16
It provides incentives for the conservation of natural resources.	63 (32.5)	65 (33.5)	43 (22.2)	17 (8.8)	6 (3.1)	3.84
It improves the provision and maintainance of infrastructures.	92 (47.4)	72 (37.1)	19 (9.8)	6 (3.1)	5 (2.6)	4.24

Unlike in a similar study by Vogt and Jun (2004) who discovered that general residents were not as informed about the different types of tourism segments who visited their destination and therefore were not able to offer their opinion on the types of impacts they may have, data in table 4 above presents and summarized the opinions of the respondents on the impact of sport tourism on Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile – Ife. While majority were neutral (undecided) that sport tourism distorts the pristine culture of the host community (mean = 2.50), majority also agreed that: it promotes host cultural activities (mean = 4.16), it provided opportunity to attend interesting event (mean = 4.37), it was an opportunity to have fun with family and friends (mean = 4.37), it established the host cultural identity (mean = 4.26), it increased entertainment opportunity for the residents (mean = 4.41), it provided opportunity to meet new people (mean = 4.51), it made residents feel good about

themselves and their community (mean = 4.28), it showcased the host community in the positive light (mean = 4.12), it promotes the development and maintainance of public facilities (mean = 4.57), it created temporary job opportunities (mean = 4.60), it increased turn over for businesses (mean = 4.28), it improved the standard of living of residents who engaged in commodities' supply during the games (mean = 4.16), it provided incentives for the conservation of natural resources (mean = 3.84) and it improved the provision and maintainance of infrastructures (mean = 4.24). While some of these results agreed with the findings of Nancy and Craig (2010), others supported the earlier work of Ntloko and Swart (2008). Therefore, sport tourism is a veritable tool for opening up, developing, and attracting tourists to a destination considering the fact that the inherent positive impact of such approach far outweighs the negative impact on the host community.



Plates 3: Family cohesion as a social impact of sport tourism

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Negative Effects of Sport Tourism on Host Community

Negative Effects of Sport Tourism	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq (%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq (%)	Mean
It increases crime rate.	23 (11.8)	37 (19.1)	35 (18.0)	52 (26.8)	47 (24.2)	2.51
It causes traffic congestion and parking difficulties.	42 (21.6)	79 (40.7)	29 (14.9)	25 (12.9)	19 (9.8)	3.52
Its development cost is too high.	25 (12.9)	62 (32.0)	44 (22.7)	38 (19.6)	25 (12.9)	3.12
It encourages social vices.	22 (11.3)	52 (26.8)	47 (24.2)	40 (20.6)	33 (17.0)	2.50
It denies residents' access to public facilities.	25 (12.9)	61 (31.4)	40 (20.6)	48 (24.7)	20 (10.3)	3.32
Only few members of the host community benefited.	33 (17.0)	46 (23.7)	37 (19.1)	53 (27.3)	25 (12.9)	3.06
It increases general price level of commodities.	34 (17.5)	64 (33.0)	35 (18.0)	43 (22.2)	18 (9.3)	2.50
It disrupts the lifestyle of residents and cause inconvenience.	35 (18.0)	62 (32.0)	30 (15.5)	43 (22.2)	24 (12.4)	3.21
It creates litter, excessive noise and pollution.	43 (22.2)	76 (39.2)	29 (14.9)	27 (13.9)	19 (9.8)	3.50
Construction of sport tourism facilities destroys the natural environment and causes damage to natural areas.	32 (16.5)	51 (26.3)	29 (14.9)	40 (20.6)	42 (21.6)	2.49

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4 presents the responses of the interviewees on the negative effects of sport tourism on the host community. Data from the table shows that majority agreed that; sport tourism caused traffic congestion and parking difficulties (mean = 3.52), denied residents' access to public facilities (mean = 3.32), disrupted the lifestyle of residents and caused inconvenience (mean = 3.21), created litters, excessive noise and pollution (mean = 3.50), involved high development cost (mean = 3.12) and that only few members of the host community benefited from the event (mean = 3.06). Other tested negative effects on which respondents were neutral include that; sport tourism increased crime rate (mean = 2.51), encouraging social vices (mean = 2.50), increased general price level of commodities (mean = 2.50) and that construction of sport tourism facilities destroyed the natural environment (mean = 2.49). While some of these findings concurred with the conclusion of earlier researchers in this field of study such as; Ntloko and Swart (2008), Nancy and Craig (2010), others were against them. Thus, it could be said that factors characterizing different sport tourism events such as; its nature, organizers, venue, duration, scope, participants etc. may be responsible for these differences.

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Motivating Factors for Hosting Sport Tourism

Motivating Factors	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq (%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq (%)	Mean
Conducive weather condition	26 (13.4)	40 (20.6)	116 (59.8)	9 (4.6)	3 (1.5)	3.41
Government support	20 (10.3)	38 (19.6)	124 (63.9)	6 (3.1)	6 (3.1)	3.32
Support from sponsors	33 (17.0)	41 (21.1)	-----	118(60.8)	2 (1.0)	3.54
Economic gains	36 (18.6)	39 (20.1)	116 (69.8)	3 (1.5)	-----	3.56
Community prestige	37 (19.1)	37 (19.1)	116 (69.8)	2 (1.0)	2 (1.0)	3.55
Availability of sporting facilities	48 (24.7)	28 (14.4)	115 (59.3)	3 (1.5)	-----	3.63
Availability of fund	47 (24.2)	24 (12.4)	119 (61.3)	2 (1.0)	2 (1.0)	3.87
Availability of accommodation	48 (24.7)	31 (16.0)	112 (57.7)	3 (1.5)	-----	3.65
Availability of social infrastructures	47 (24.2)	30 (15.5)	114 (58.8)	1 (0.5)	2 (1.0)	3.63
Hospitality of residents	46 (23.7)	27 (13.9)	116 (59.8)	3 (1.5)	2 (1.0)	3.59
Security	55 (28.4)	20 (10.3)	113 (58.2)	3 (1.5)	3 (1.5)	3.64

Source: Field Survey, 2014

This study further added a new thing to this field of study by identifying motivating factors for hosting sport tourism. Data in table 5 presents the outcome of this inquiry. Majority of the respondents agreed that the motivating factors for hosting sport tourism event include the following; conducive weather condition (mean = 3.41), government support (mean = 3.32), sponsors' support (mean = 3.54), economic gains (mean = 3.56), community prestige (mean = 3.55), availability of sporting facilities (mean = 3.63), availability of fund (mean = 3.87), availability of accommodation (mean = 3.65), availability of social infrastructures (mean = 3.63), hospitality of residents (mean = 3.59) and security (mean = 3.64).

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between the socio – economic characteristics of respondents and perception of sport tourism

Table 6: Chi – Square Analysis Showing the Relationship between Socio – Economic Characteristics of Respondents and Perception of Sport Tourism

Variables	χ^2	Df	P – value
Age	165.2	2	0.01
Religion	192.8	2	0.01
Tribe	340.6	3	0.01
Marital status	152.4	2	0.01
Number of children	257.2	3	0.01
Level of education	399.9	3	0.01
Type of work	260.0	4	0.01
Monthly income	443.3	2	0.01
Social organization	585.4	4	0.01

The above chi – square analysis showed a significant relationship between socio – economic characteristics of respondents such as; age ($\chi^2 = 165.2$), religion ($\chi^2 = 192.8$), tribe ($\chi^2 = 340.6$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 152.4$), number of children ($\chi^2 = 257.2$), level of education ($\chi^2 = 399.9$), occupation ($\chi^2 = 260.0$), monthly income ($\chi^2 = 443.3$), participation in social organization ($\chi^2 = 585.4$) and perception of sport tourism. This implies that the various positions occupied by the respondents in the above listed socio – economic status played a significant role in influencing their perception of sport tourism.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between socio – economic characteristics of respondents and impact of sport tourism

Table 7: Chi – Square Analysis Showing the Relationship between Socio – Economic Characteristics of Respondents and Impact of Sport Tourism

Variables	χ^2	Df	P – value
Age	165.2	2	0.01
Religion	192.8	2	0.01
Tribe	340.6	3	0.01
Marital status	152.4	2	0.01
Number of children	257.2	3	0.01
Level of education	399.9	3	0.01
Type of work	260.0	4	0.01
Monthly income	443.3	2	0.01
Social organization	585.4	4	0.01

The chi – square analysis in table 7 above showed a significant relationship between socio – economic features of respondents such as; age ($\chi^2 = 165.2$), religion ($\chi^2 = 192.8$), tribe ($\chi^2 = 340.6$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 152.4$), number of children ($\chi^2 = 257.2$), level of education ($\chi^2 = 399.9$), occupation ($\chi^2 = 260.0$), monthly income ($\chi^2 = 443.3$), participation in social organization ($\chi^2 = 585.4$) and impact of sport tourism on them. This shows that the status of the respondents in relation to their socio – economic features partly dictates the impact of sport tourism on the respondents.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference between male and female respondents' perception of sport tourism

Table 8: Result of t- Test Analysis Showing no significant difference between Male and Female Respondents' Perception of Sport Tourism

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	T	Df	Mean Deviation	Standard Error	P – value
Male	54.05	8.081				1.245	
Female	53.20	8.986	0.671	193	0.854	1.273	0.50

F = 0.007; Significance = 0.935

Result in table 8 above revealed no significant difference between male (mean = 54.05) and female (mean = 53.20) perception of sport tourism with a t – value of 0.671 at a p – value of 0.05. Thus, it could be generalized that both male and female perceived sport tourism in the same way. However, while Nancy and Craig (2010) reported a noticeable descriptive difference between male and female and support for sport tourism, this study established no significant difference between both male and female perception of sport tourism.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant relationship between respondents' perception and impact of sport tourism.

Table 9: Pearson Moment Correlation Analysis Showing the Relationship between Respondents' Perception and Impact of Sport Tourism

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Coefficient of Determinant (r^2)	P – value
Impact of sport tourism	62.71	10.35			
Perception of sport tourism	53.71	8.44	0.157*	0.025	0.05

The correlation analysis in table 9 above showed a significant relationship between respondents' perception of sport tourism ($r = 0.157$) and the exact impact of such event on the individual at $p < 0.05$). This implies that the way individuals perceive sport tourism determines the impact of the event on the people socially, culturally and economically.

Conclusion

Sport is an important activity within tourism industry and tourism is a fundamental characteristic of sport (Hinch and Higham, 2001). Glasson and Godfrey (1995) noted that tourism has been argued to be the world's largest industry, accounting for about 5.5% of the world's Gross National Product and 6% of the employment. Tourism is a trillion dollar industry. Sport is a multi-billion dollar industry worldwide and has become a dominant and defining force in the lives of millions of people globally (Martin, 2007). Sports and tourism are distinct but interrelated socio-cultural events and experiences of a society. Available in literatures are the different roles that sport tourism can be deployed for in any host community: it can be used to manage social problems such as criminal behavior. Emery (2002) stated that sport tourism is more than just healthy living, physical activity and active lifestyle because it contributes to social, economic and cultural character of host nations. Sport tourism is used as a growth strategy adopted by cities in order to achieve strategic corporate objectives such as urban

regeneration (Bruce, 1995; in Emery, 2002). Sport-led regeneration of a host community is the way sport is used in regenerating an area economically, socially, physically, and environmentally (Larissa, 2010). A good example of a city which adopted sport tourism as a strategy for urban regeneration is Sheffield, United Kingdom that hosted the World Students Games in 1991.

However, from this study, top in the perceptions of members of host community on sport tourism include that; it promoted local entrepreneurship, it was a good opportunity to showcase the culture of the host community, and that it facilitated the provision, maintenance and improvement of social infrastructures among others positive perceptions, majority also concurred that it disrupted the host university's academic calendar. On the impact of sport tourism on the host community, while majority were neutral (undecided) that sport tourism distorts the pristine culture of the host community, top in the list of impact the event had on the host community include the following; it created temporary job opportunities, it increased turn over for businesses, it facilitated the development and maintenance of public facilities, it improved the standard of living of residents who engaged in commodities' supply during the games, it provided incentives for the conservation of natural resources, it was an opportunity to have fun with family and friends, and it promoted host cultural activities.

A probe into the negative effects of hosting sport tourism in Obafemi Awolowo University revealed that it denied residents' access to public facilities, increased crime rate, encouraged social vices, disrupted the lifestyle of residents and caused inconvenience; created litters, excessive noise and pollution, involved high developmental cost and only few members of the host community benefited from the event. This research also identified the motivating factors for hosting sport tourism event to include; conducive climatic condition, government support, sponsors' support, expected economic gains, community prestige, availability of sporting facilities, availability of fund, availability of accommodation, availability of social infrastructures, hospitality of residents and security. The hypotheses tested showed a significant relationship between socio – economic characteristics such as; age, religion, tribe, marital status, number of children, level of education, occupation, monthly income, participation in social organization and perception of sport tourism at $p < 0.05$. There was also a significant relationship between the above listed socio – economic characteristics at the same listed chi – square values and the impact of sport tourism at $p < 0.05$. A t – test analysis showed no significant difference between male and female respondent's perception of sport tourism with a t – value of 0.671 at a p – value of 0.50. Effort to establish the relationship between respondents' perceptions and impact of sport tourism involved the use of correlation analysis which showed a significant relationship between respondents' perception of sport tourism and impact of the event on the people at $p < 0.05$.

Recommendations

The relevance of hosting a sport tourism event in an attempt to develop a destination cannot be over – emphasized. Sport tourism event is a catalyst for urban renewal, which in turn allow for development of both capacity and destination attraction for tourism. A good example of a city that re- emerged from a sporting event is the Barcelona which hosted the Olympic Games of 1992. During the games, there was a decrease in unemployment levels from 18.4% to 9.6% regionally and 20.9% to 15.5% nationally. In the build up to the games, the city increased its hotel bed capacity by 34.9%, which continued many years after the event. However, in an attempt to ensure that NUGA games offer benefits that are in line with the above listed and judging from the findings of this study, the following recommendations could be useful:

- Host University should employ NUGA as a tool for achieving significant goals, rather than mere hosting the games for the fun of it. Such goals should be in line with the pressing needs of the university, goals such as; building students' hostel, constructing or developing sporting facilities, improving social infrastructures among others are worthwhile goals.
- Cultural tourism should be properly integrated into NUGA games. Though it is presently part of the event, but the role it plays is not significant enough. NUGA should be used as another means of promoting culture among the students and other participants.
- This study pointed out that NUGA has the potential of attracting international tourists; hence, the games should be well – promoted towards achieving this objective.
- Federal Government of Nigeria should do the needful to ensure regularity in Nigerian universities' calendar. Incessant strike actions by various unions of university's workers are one of the great obstacles for organizing a memorable NUGA games. The edition of the games involved in this study came up after a six months strike action by the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU).
- People who have experience in organizing the event of this nature which may include experts in tourism, sport, event management among other relevant disciplines should be given opportunity to make up a significant percentage of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) of NUGA. The reason for this recommendation boiled down to the fact that some lapses which were observed during the 24th edition of NUGA games showed lack of experience on the part of some members of LOC.
- All stakeholders should be properly involved when planning to host NUGA games to avoid any

problem that may emanate from neglect of important stakeholders. Students of Obafemi Awolowo University were not properly carried along in planning for NUGA 2014. This led to a problem in which students of the host university did not want to surrender their hostels for the use of the NUGA participants.

- The management of NUGA should strive to always have a smooth and hitch - free event devoid of any challenges. A scene of non – payment of officials’ allowances which lasted for hours and during which the games were stopped was observed during this research.

References

- Andriotis, K. (2005) Community Groups’ Perceptions of and Preferences for Tourism Development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29: 67–90.
- Emery, P. R., (2002) ‘Bidding to Host a Major Sports Events: The Local Organization Committee Perspective’, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 5(4):316 - 335.
- Gibson, H. J., (1998) ‘Sport Tourism: A Critical Analysis of Research’, *Journal of Sport Management Review*, 1: 145-76.
- Glasson, J., Godfrey, K. & Godfrey, B. (1995), *Towards Visitors’ Impact Management: Visitors Impacts, Carrying Capacity and Management Responses in Europe’s Historic Towns and Cities*, England Amesbury.
- Hinch, T. D. and Higham, J. E. S. (2001), Sport Tourism: A framework for research, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3: 45 - 58.
- Higham, J. (1999), "Sport as an Avenue of Tourism Development: An analysis of the Positive and Negative Impacts of Sport Tourism". *Current Issues in Tourism*, 2(1): 82 – 90.
- Ifeanyichuhwu C. E. (2013) Sports Tourism as an Instrument for Nigeria’s Development in the 21st Century: Challenges and Way Forward, *Journal of Education and Practice* 4 (4): 143 – 148.
- Larissa, D., (2010) ‘Sport and Economic Regeneration: A Winning Combination’, *Journal of Sport in Society*, 13 (10): 1438 – 1457.
- Martin, D. S. (2007), *Cognitive Scaling, Emotions, Team Identity and Future Behavioural Intentions: An Examination of Sporting Event Venues*. An Unpublished PhD Thesis of Auburn University.
- Murphy, P.E. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: Methuen.
- Nancy, H. and Craig, R. (2010) The Perceived Impacts of Sport Tourism: An Urban Host Community Perspective, *Journal of Sport Management*, 24: 119 – 138.
- Ntloko, N. J. and Swart, K. (2008) Sport Tourism Event Impact on the Host Community, *South African Journal of Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 30 (2): 79 – 93.
- Ojeme, E.O. (2010). Shouldering the Burden of Sports Development in Nigeria: Is the School Physical Education Curriculum Living up to Expectations? *Inaugural Lecture Series* 110:21, University of Benin.
- Pigeassou, C., Bui-Xuan, G. & Gleyse, J. (1998), Epistemological Issues on Sport Tourism: Challenge for a New Scientific Field. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 5 (2): 27 - 34.
- Standeven, J. (1994). Sport and Tourism in the South of England in J. Mester (ed.), *Second European Forum, Sport Sciences in Europe: Current and Future Perspectives* (137 - 152), Aachen.
- Standeven, J. and De Knop, P. (1999) ‘*Sport Tourism*’, USA: Human Kinetics Publication.
- Turco, D.M., Swart, K., Bob, U. and Moodley, V. (2003), Socio-Economic Impacts of Sport Tourism in the Durban Minacity, South Africa. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 8: 223 - 239.
- Vogt, C. A., & Jun, S.H. (2004), Residents’ Attitudes toward Tourist Market Segments and Tourism Development in Valdez, Alaska: A Comparison of Residents’ Perceptions of Tourist Impact on the Economy and Quality of Life. *Proceedings from the 2004 Northwest Recreation Research Symposium*, Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, 404 - 411
- Weed, M. and Bull, C. (2009) ‘*Sport Tourism: Participants, Policy and Providers*’, 1st and 2nd Editions, UK: Elsevier Limited.